

explanatory and is well known to those skilled in the art, however, applicant has cancelled Claim 1 in which those terms appear. Examiner states that those terms lack antecedent basis, and if Rule 1.75(d)(1) doesn't apply, please so advise. MPEP Patent Rule 1.75(d)(1) states in part: "--- terms and phrases used in the claims must find clear support, or antecedent basis **in the description---**".

On page 3 lines 4 - 20, examiner questions clarity of terms as follows:

"Counterbore of predetermined length": In the specification, please see Figure 1 and page 4 ln 37 that illustrates the predetermined counterbore length comprising conical surfaces 70 and 76. Applicant believes that "a predetermined counterbore length" is distinctive from "a predetermined end length", as defined on Page 2 ln 32, however, end length has been eliminated from the claims. The term "predetermined length" is simply to indicate that it is not the entire joint length.

Applicant is at a loss as how to define "box thread maximum diameter" and the "pin thread minimum diameter" any clearer, because they have been used in the art for many years. However, insertion of the term "root" was done in an attempt to do so.


Applicant believes that revisions of claims 2 and 3 clarify the remaining 112 rejections.

Claim 1 stands rejected and it has been cancelled.

Claim 23 has been added to replace cancelled claim 1.


Applicant requests that the application be reconsidered, reexamined and passed to issue at an early date.

Respectfully submitted,


John D Watts, P.E.
wedgethread@aol.com

8301 Guthrie, Austin, TX 78750-7852
(512) 418-8668 fax(512) 418-8633

Certificate of Mailing: I certify that this correspondence was posted with the United States Postal Service on the date shown below in an envelope with sufficient postage for first Class Mail and addressed to: Commissioner of Patents
Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

 11-14-2003
John D. Watts Date